

BROBDINGNAG

Brobdingnag #84

Rules Issue.

12 July 1968

Rule Disputes.

As Graustark players have already been informed, I expect to run their games for some moves between now and early September. I have also had a letter from Charles Turner stating that he would like to turn the remaining Armageddonia games over to me to run. Then I expect to be handling one move of the many Erehwon games. As a result I thought it would be a good idea to have a run down of the various points of rule controversy that have arisen over the years. A further reason for publishing this article at this time is that BROB has recently acquired a number of additional subscribers, mainly as a result of the notice appearing in Valhalla. Although they have played Diplomacy before they are newcomers to the postal game. I have had one letter from one of them saying he is confused by the nomenclature used, Brannan's Rule and the like, and I have no doubt that others feel the same.

It will be noticed that, for the most part, the article only refers to the position, in the various rule disputes, taken by John Boardman (Graustark), Charles Turner (Armageddonia), Rod Walker (Erehwon), and myself (BROB). The stand of other journals is only referred to in a few cases which are of special interest. To do otherwise would have meant expanding this article beyond all reasonable bounds. This issue is being sent to Graustark players at the same time as to regular BROB subscribers. It will be sent to Armageddonia and Erehwon players as soon as I receive an address list for them. I would be grateful if the three gamesmasters mentioned would look over the article and inform me if I am in error concerning their respective stands on any of the items under discussion. (Thought you would go away for the summer, and forget Diplomacy did you?) On any item on which a particular zine has taken no stand its games will be conducted according to BROB procedures.

Players in these games will find, in another part of this issue, some points of playing procedure in BROB, such as deadlines, my phone number, and the like. What we are concerned with in this article is not playing procedure but those points where the rulebook is, or seems, ambiguous. The points arise quite as much in over-the-board play as in postal games, although some of them are more serious in the peculiar circumstances of play by mail.

1. Koning's Rule. Consider the following set of moves:

RUSSIA: Army St. Petersburg to Norway.

ENGLAND: Army Norway. Sea to St. Petersburg. Fleet Barents Sea supports army Norway to St. Petersburg. Fleet North Sea to Norway.

The English force in Norway certainly succeeds in reaching St. Petersburg, since it is a supported force being opposed by an unsupported one. But does the fleet, North Sea, reach Norway? If we take literally the rulebook statement, "If two units are ordered to move to the same space, neither may move.", then the move of the fleet to Norway is stood off by the move St. Petersburg to Norway. On the other hand, if we look at the illustrative example, in the back of the rulebook, for Spring 1902, we see that the move of the fleet is shown as succeeding.

The question of whether a unit which is dislodged, the army St. Petersburg in this case, can still stand off another unit trying to enter the space from which the dislodging attack came, has been one of the most hotly debated issues in the interpretation of the rules. Unlike many of the other rule arguments, it is of considerable practical importance, as cases of it arise frequently in actual games.

Graustark does not allow Koning's Rule. I.e. the fleet in the North Sea, in the above example, does not succeed in its attack on Norway.

Armageddonia does allow Koning's Rule, that is, if a country succeeds in dislodging a foreign unit, an additional unit may be brought up behind the unit making the dislodgement, without being stood off by an attack on that space made by the unit dislodged.

Erehwon uses Konings rule

Brobdingnag uses Koning's rule.

2. Wells' Extension of Koning's Rule. Suppose, in the example given above that Russia had had an army in Sweden which supported the attack on Norway from St. Petersburg. Suppose that England had an additional army in Finland supporting its attack on St. Petersburg. The unit in St. Petersburg would again be dislodged. But to allow the fleet from N. Sea to enter Norway now, would mean to permit an unsupported force to enter a space in opposition to a supported one. Wells' Extension of Koning's Rule permits this.

Graustark does not allow Wells' Extension.

Armageddonia allowe Wells' Extension.

Erehwon allows Wells' Extension.

Brobdingnag allows Wells' Extension.

3. Boardman's Dilemma. Suppose Germany plays Army Berlin to Prussia, Army Silesia support army Berlin to Prussia. And suppose Russia plays Army Prussia to Silesia. The latter move is not "an attack from the side" and does not cut the support of the Silesian unit. As indicated in the rulebook, page 4, support is only cut if the supporting unit is attacked from a space different from that into which it is

supporting. Everyone therefore agrees that the support of the unit Silesia, in the example above is good. Suppose, however, that the attack on Silesia was itself supported, say Russian army Warsaw supports Army Prussia to Silesia, so that the unit in Silesia is itself dislodged. Is its support still good? This is the famous Boardman's Dilemma.

Graustark allows the support of the dislodged unit to remain effective. This is sometimes called the Boardman-Rulebook solution of the dilemma.

Armageddonia support remains good even though supporting unit is dislodged.

Erehwon. The support is out. This was not the original ruling of Erehwon on the matter but was adopted after a referendum of its players several months ago.

Broddingnag allows the support to remain good.

And this is the place to mention Miller's Rule. Don Miller, and his magazines, made an attempt to solve both the Koning's Rule question, and Boardman's Dilemma by the adoption of a rule covering both cases. The rule can be variously phrased but amounts to saying that a dislodged force has no effect on the actions of other units on the board. This automatically gives Koning's Rule. It gives the Calhaver-Miller solution to the Dilemma. This is a very attractive solution. Unfortunately, it appears in the pages of Diplomania and not in the rulebook.

4. The Victory Criterion. The rulebook states, "As soon as one player gains a majority of the pieces on the board, he is the winner." As there are 34 supply centres on the board, each capable of supporting one unit, it is apparent that a player who has 18 forces on the board has won the game. However, there can be fewer forces actually on the board than there are supply centres. The result is that, in some circumstances, fewer than 18 forces might constitute a majority. Four different sets of criteria have been adopted by one zine or another, and sometimes they appear in combination. The four:

- A. One player has eighteen forces actually on the board.
- B. One player has eighteen centres. Only used in Wild'n Wooly, this rule has the bad feature that it is possible for a player to own eighteen centres, to be unable to build for them due to occupied home territory, and then to be declared the winner when he actually has fewer forces in play than his opponent(s).
- C. The majority of forces on the board, at the end of the Spring moves, or at the end of the Fall moves, or at the end of the builds, usually called the Winter moves in postal Diplomacy.
- D. As C above, except that the builds are regarded as part of the Fall move; in this version victory can only be declared in our Spring or Winter, not in our Fall.

Graustark uses D.

Armageddonia uses D

Erehwon uses C

Brobdingnag uses C. (But I am disenchanted with the rule. See an article on this elsewhere in this issue or to appear shortly.

5. Ties and Draws. The rulebook says nothing whatever about drawn games. The passage quoted in the section above is the only statement about the conclusion of a game. However, it was early found that some games went to a split board position, two players each having 17 pieces on the board. In the early days, in some quarters, there was a tendency to regard such a position as an automatic draw. As far as I know, no magazine now holds that view and a game is allowed to continue past the 17-17 point if either player wishes to do so. Only if both decide that the game cannot progress further is the game declared a tie.

More recently it has been disclosed that there are other deadlocked positions in addition to the split-board one. For instance, one player may have 16 forces. Two other players allied against him may have the remaining 18. After an indecisive struggle, perhaps continuing for some time, all survivors may agree that it is impossible to advance. Moreover a change of alliance pattern would be highly unlikely in the circumstances, as each of the minor powers will be aware that to strike would mean handing the game to the giant. Again it has been normal to declare a draw in such a case.

Approximately one quarter of published games, so far completed, have been draws, of either the split-board or the multi-player variety. In all of them, I believe, such a conclusion has been agreed on by all survivors; to declare a draw when all survivors wish it may be regarded as the universally accepted practice. It is when one (or more) of the survivors is stubborn and insists on continuing although the others think that no further progress is possible, that the difficulty arises. If we took the rulebook literally a game might continue forever with the same sets of moves being repeated endlessly. No gamesmaster can be expected to carry on indefinitely with a dead-locked board. While this is more a question of game management than of interpretation of the rules, it is closely enough related to The Victory Criterion to be discussed here.

Graustark: After three playing "years" with no change of supply centres a draw is declared.

Armageddonia's rule is not known to me.

Erehwon's rule is also unknown.

BROBDINGNAG: After 3 years without change of supply centres all players are asked to submit an outline plan of campaign. If one such plan appears feasible the game continues, otherwise a draw is declared.

6. Support standing of a unit ordered to move. In the early days of the game there were many players who regarded as legal the set of moves,

Army Bulgaria to Rumania

Army Constantinople support army Bulgaria.

The idea behind this was that if the army ordered to Rumania failed to make it due to a stand-off, then it would receive support in its present location of Bulgaria. This question was thoroughly debated in the first year of postal play, 1963-64, and the understanding was reached, which has been held virtually unanimously ever since, that only moves which have been actually ordered may be supported. The one exception, which is explicitly allowed in the rulebook, is that a unit not ordered at all, may be supported where it stands. But a unit ordered to move may not be supported in place; the support order in the example above accordingly fails. In spite of this issue having been settled more than four years ago, moves similar to the above are tried from time to time; I noticed an example in Graustark just the other day.

Graustark, Armageddonia, Erehwon, and Brobdingnag, and, indeed, all other established zines, rule the same way on this: the support order fails.

(In case my words "only moves which have been actually ordered may be supported" should itself give rise to a misunderstanding, it should be pointed out that a fleet doing convoy duty is regarded as standing and may be supported in place. For instance,

Army Edinburgh to Norway.

Fleet North Sea convoy army Edinburgh to Norway.

Fleet London support fleet North Sea

is a legitimate set of orders, and the fleet in the North Sea stands with a strength of two. I.e., it would take a co-ordinated attack by three fleets to dislodge it. I remember, in my first game, having to ask Boardman, who was gamesmaster, about this.)

7. Support by fleets in provinces with split coast lines. At one time there was a good deal of discussion as to just what support could be given, or received, by fleets in provinces with split coastlines. The rulebook states that a fleet adjacent to a split coastline province can support in that province, regardless of the division into two coasts. There was once some speculation as to whether in included "into". That is, while it was agreed that a fleet in Gascony could support a fleet in Spain, south coast, it was debated whether it could support the move, Fleet Lyon to Spain, south coast. Most magazines now use a definition of "in" to include "into" in such cases. There is the further question of reciprocity: Since fleet Gascony can support fleet Spain, south coast, can fleet Spain, south coast, support fleet Gascony? Usually the decision has been in the negative, although the question was raised again very recently.

Graustark, Armageddonia, Erehwon, and Brobdingnag are agreed on this question. In all of them: Fleet Gascony can support a fleet or an army in or into the south coast of Spain. But a fleet in the

south coast of Spain cannot support a fleet or an army in Gascony. Similarly in all analogous cases.

8. The Cutting of the Cutting of Support. About thrss years ago, in Costaguana, Conrad von Metzke suggested that, just as the attack on a supporting unit nullifies the support which it is attempting to give, so an attack on the unit attacking the supporting piece, should re-establish the support. For example, in the standard game, if players ordered,

Germany: Army Silesia to Warsaw.

Army Prussia support army Silesia to Warsaw.

Russia: Fleet Baltic to Prussia.

then the support of the Prussian army is cut by the naval attack from the side and the Silesian army is deprived of its expected support. It was Conrad's suggestion that the German move, Fleet Kiel to Baltic, should, in turn, make the Russian fleet "turn to face its attacker". Thus the Russian move, fleet Baltic to Prussia, would no longer be effective in cutting support and the Silesian army would move with a strength of two. In a way, this is like the "Kolin game", described in section 32, except that it is much less general.

It should be noted that von Metzke made his suggestion for a future revised form of the game; he did not suggest that it was a legitimate interpretation of the current game. von Metzke is, indeed, a stickler for the letter of the rulebook and neither he nor any other publisher has used his suggested rule amendment. In Brobdignag, and in the other zines with which we are here concerned, the move of the fleet Kiel, in the example, has no effect on the support cutting action of the fleet Baltic.

(Some reader probably thinks that that if every gamesmaster followed von Metzke's example and was a stickler for the letter of the rulebook, then all disagreements about the rules would disappear. The other gamesmaster who has been especially vehement in support of "the rulebook, the whole rulebook, and nothing but the rulebook" is John Boardman. In spite of the fact that they both cling tenaciously to the Rock of the Law, Boardman and von Metzke have arrived at opposite conclusions in the cases of Brannen's Rule, the Coastal Crawl, and perhaps others. The Rock turns out to be a broken reed.)

(The phrase "The Cutting of the Cutting of Support" was first introduced into rule discussion in issue #44. More recently it has been used in Graustark, in Diplomania, and elsewhere in the sense of what we here call "Boardman's Dilemma", quite a different question. This is only one instance among many of differences in nomenclature. If Rod Walker succeeds in getting his Diplomacy Federation formed, its first practical task should not be to set up a Rules Committee, but to set up a Nomenclature Committee. Otherwise the members of the Rules Committees, when it is formed, will not be able to understand what they are talking about.) /of this magazines.

9. Cutting One's Own Throat. A player submits moves

Army Prussia to Warsaw
Army Silesia support army Prussia to Warsaw
Army Munich to Silesia.

Does the movement of the army Munich cut the support of the army in Silesia or not? Of course the move is non-sensical and was only made because the player concerned was so eager to move everything eastward as fast as possible and neglected to notice that he was tripping over his own feet. However, nonsensical moves are sometimes ordered, as a glance at almost any Diplomacy zine will show. And the gamesmaster has to know how to handle the situation if it occurs.

Graustark holds that the support is still good.

Armageddonia holds that the support is still good.

Erehwon's ruling is not known.

Brobdingnag, I suppose, allows the support to continue. Though Calhamer has answered most of the rule dispute questions I have asked him, this is one of the exceptions.

10. Brannan's Rule. In the early issues of Wild 'n Woolly appearing at the end of 1964, Brannan published the set of rules to be used in his games. Among the rules was the following which since has become known as Brannan's Rule. "A. A convoy move does not cut support against the fleet in the body of water through which the army is convoyed last. B. When one of the fleets in the convoy chain is dislodged, the attempted convoy does not cut any support at all." The letters A and B do not appear in the original, I have added them for greater ease in discussing the two parts.

10.1 Brannan's Rule, Part A. The first part of Brannan's Rule is often quoted under the alternate wording, "For the purpose of support cutting, a convoyed army is regarded as coming from the space occupied by the last convoying fleet." In fact many discussions have derived additional implications of the rule from this alternate wording without noticing that it is not what Brannan actually said. An example of the rule. Austria has a fleet in the Adriatic. Italy has fleets in Apulia and Venice. If Italy plays Fleet Apulia support Fleet Venice to Adriatic, Fleet Venice to Adriatic; and if Austria plays fleet Adriatic to Apulia, then the last move does not cut the support of Apulia, since this is a frontal attack, not an attack from the side. Brannan feels that if Austria, instead of playing as indicated above played instead, Army Albania to Apulia, fleet Adriatic convoy, that the same principle should hold: that this would still be a frontal attack and so not cut the support.

The need for the rule arises from a certain ambiguity in the

English language, the word "from" being used in two different, slightly, senses. If one sees a taxi, driving to town along the road that leads from the local airport, the back seat being occupied by a man in Arabic head-dress, one might think to oneself "He is coming from the airport" or one might think "He comes from the Middle East". One supposition is as plausible as the other and there is no real contradiction between them.

Unfortunately, a conflict in the two ideas of "from", directly or immediately from, on the one hand, ultimately from, on the other, does cause a difficulty in Diplomacy. The rulebook states, "If a unit ordered to support in a given province is attacked from a different province the unit disregards its order to support, "turns to face its attacker", and defends its own position." First we note that the rulebook wording is very bad anyhow. "Space" should be used instead of "province"; otherwise a fleet on the high seas could never cut support. However, that detail aside, does the expression "from a (different) province" mean "from the province in which the unit was previously stationed", or does it mean "the space through which the unit moves to reach the battle area"? In normal cases the two are identical. But, in the case of a convoyed army, the two differ and there is nothing in the rulebook to decide the issue of the correct use of "from". Brannan's Rule, therefore, plugs a real omission in the rulebook.

Readers more or less unfamiliar with Diplomacy lines should note that it is the A part of Brannan's Rule which has been most extensively discussed. In fact, many journals use the expression "Brannan's Rule" to mean the A part of it alone.

10.2 Brannan's Rule, Part B. It is indicated in the rulebook that if a convoy move is attempted, and if the convoying fleet is dislodged, then the move does not succeed. It has sometimes been argued that this makes Brannan's Rule, Part B, redundant, the view being that it is merely a re-phrasing of the rulebook statement. This is, however, not quite true, due to the peculiar way that we use the word "succeed" in Diplomacy. We use "succeed" of a move in the sense that the unit has been able to carry out the order given to it. Note, though, that many orders are made with no intention at all of their "succeeding" in this sense. For instance, a foreign held space is often attacked with no intention at all of the attacking unit arriving there, but merely with the intention of cutting the support that the foreign unit might be giving. And, similarly, for stand-offs. (Sometimes, indeed, a player's position can be thrown off balance by a move "succeeding", when a stand off had been expected. Whence the remark, heard frequently at the Diplomacy board, "My move succeeded, damn it!" Wives and other bystanders become convinced of the idiocy of Diplomacy when they hear its players bemoan their own success; as if they needed convincing.)

Anyhow, without B's rule, part B, or some equivalent, the following Turkish moves,

Army Smyrna to Apulia
Fleet Aegean convoy army Smyrna to Apulia
Fleet Ionian Sea convoy army Smyrna to Apulia

would cut the support of any unit stationed in Apulia. Moreover, that support would be cut even if either of the convoying fleets, or both, was dislodged. This is not a situation which would be accepted happily by any of the "realists", i.e., those who believe the game should closely mimic the action of real warfare. My own feeling is that this section of Brannan's Rule does not go far enough. I would say that an army ordered to move by convoy, if one of the convoying fleets is dislodged, has no effect at all on movements in or into the space to which it is ordered. That is, the move in the example above, should not be able to stand-off a move to Apulia, if a convoying fleet is dislodged. Under the rulebook statement only prohibiting "success", i.e., actual landing, a stand-off would still be allowed. And so would it be under this part of Brannan's rule. Brannan and, especially, Calhamer usually take a "realist" view of the game. I am sure what they mean is that if a fleet is dislodged then an army convoyed by it has no effect what so ever at its point of destination, but that it not quite what either of them say.

Graustark uses Brannan's Rule. The example it uses however is from Part A of the Rule only and I do not know where Boardman stands on Part B.

Armageddonia: Brannan's Rule is NOT used. The discussion is again confined to Part A.

Erehwon does not follow Brannan's Rule. The discussion is again confined to the A Part.

Brobdingnag uses Brannan's Rule, in both parts, and with the further extension, described above, to include stand-offs.

11. Convoy between contiguous provinces. Is the set of moves given below legal?

Army Naples to Rome

Fleet Tyrrhenian Sea convoy army Naples to Rome.

There is nothing in the rulebook to show that it isn't. It is nonsensical, perhaps, because it ties up two units to do what the army could do just as well by marching alone, but surely legal.

It was Charles Wells who pointed out, when discussion of Brannan's Rule first began, that this move would have to be reconsidered. Brannan's Rule, part A, changes the direction of attack of the Naples army. Without B's rule the attack came from Naples, with it the attack comes from the Tyrrhenian Sea. In order to allow Brannan's rule but to leave the game otherwise unaltered, Wells proposed that such a move, convoying between adjacent provinces, should not be permitted. As far as I know no one has followed his advice and outlawed the move. Graustark, Armageddonia and Brobdingnag have specifically allowed convoy between adjacent provinces. Erehwon has not declared.

12. Shagrin's Alternate Route Convoy. Suppose France has an army in Belgium which it wishes to convoy to London which is open and undefended. It has fleets in both the North Sea and English Channel, so that the convoy could be ordered by either fleet. By the rulebook a convoy is not disrupted by an attack on the convoying fleet, but

is prevented if the convoying fleet is actually dislodged. Suppose, with the example given, that Italy had two fleets able to attack the Channel fleet, and that the Germans had two able to attack the North Sea. It is by no means certain that both sets of enemies will, in fact, attack and dislodge the French fleets, although one or the other of them may. Is the following set of moves legal?

Army Belgium to London

Fleet North Sea convoy army Belgium to London

Fleet English Channel convoy army Belgium to London

The idea behind this is that if the North Sea fleet is dislodged but the Channel fleet is not, then the convoy proceeds by the Channel, and conversely. Only if both fleets were dislodged would the attack on London fail.

This is the alternate route convoy question, first raised by Richard Shagrin about a year and a half ago. The game's inventor, Allan Calhamer, on being asked about this move, implied that he felt that it should not succeed, as he regards the orders to the army as being ambiguous, and so counted as stand orders under the rules.

Graustark, Armageddonia, and Erehwon don't appear to have ruled on the question. Brobdingnag's rule is as follows. Since the orders given above are exactly what would be written if a chain of convoys were required, i.e., the army to pass through both fleets, the order is so interpreted. Therefore the convoy succeeds if neither fleet is dislodged, fails if either is dislodged.

13. Convoy of Support. From time to time it has been suggested that it should be possible to convoy an army's support, instead of the army itself. There seems little justification for this under the rules, and it is not allowed in any of Graustark, Armageddonia, Erehwon, or Brobdingnag.

14. The Misguided Army. Suppose England and Germany are allied in a war against France and that they agree that a German fleet will convoy an English army from London to Belgium, through the North Sea. Suppose at this juncture that Germany decides to change sides. It orders its fleet in the North Sea to convoy the English army to Norway instead where

1. It will be out of the way of the impending attack on Drifelin, and
2. Where the Russians and Germans have concocted a fiendish plan to annihilate it on the next move.

Is this legal? The question arose in the early days where it was greeted with cries of glee. However, Calhamer, on being appealed to, stated that orders to convoying fleet(s) and convoyed army must agree. If they don't the army remains in place. No magazine, as far as I know, has ever taken a contrary view.

15. Fate of army convoyed by dislodged fleet. Consider the following set of moves:

England: Army Yorkshire to Denmark.

Fleet North Sea convoy army Yorkshire to Denmark.

Germany: Fleet Holland to North Sea.

Fleet Helgoland Bight support fleet Holland to North Sea.

All the zines would rule the same way: The German fleet Holland would gain the North Sea. The English Fleet North Sea would have to retreat to one of the spaces open to it. The army Yorkshire would remain where it was.

Surprisingly none of the "realists" have ever challenged this view. Notice that it is not at all what would happen in real life. A fleet which had routed a convoying fleet would immediately turn its attention to the vessels being convoyed. Some would be sunk. Some would be captured. Some might escape to neutral ports to be interned. And some would make good their return home. But it would be a long time before such an army was again the fighting force that it was before setting out on its ill-fated voyage. Yet our game allows it to continue exactly where it was, quite unaffected by its mishap. All magazines rule as above however.

16. Retreat Rule. This is not really a rule dispute question but one of game management, or of adaption of the basic game to postal play. In Diplomacy a unit dislodged by a hostile force is allowed to retreat to any vacant adjacent space, except the one from which the dislodging attack came, and except any left vacant by a stand-off on the move in question. In over-the-board play the retreat takes place immediately after the move from which it arises, takes only a few seconds, and, apparently, it has always been accepted that a retreat, if possible, will be made. The physical presence of the other players, moreover, provides a force urging the player to make a move expected of him.

The situation in postal play is very different. A designated retreat takes as much time, or nearly, as a full move. The player(s) concerned must be informed of the moves, the spaces available for retreat, and time allowed for the reply. Moreover, since a certain percentage of all moves are missed in postal play, some rule must be adopted as to what is to be done if the player fails to indicate where his retreating force is to go. The rule adopted in Graustark early in the history of postal play, and universally copied since, is to annihilate a dislodged force for which no retreat order is received by the retreat deadline.

In the case of a retreating force, with only one space available for its retreat, the gamesmaster will often, in order to save time, himself order the retreat. This procedure, also, originated in Graustark and was widely copied; at one time it was used almost universally, although that is no longer the case.

We should now note that it is sometimes to the advantage of a player if he can annihilate one of his own forces and build another in a home centre to replace it. This could be his feeling, for instance, if he was under heavy attack at home. The rulebook makes no provision for annihilation of one's own forces at all, in fact it explicitly precludes it, but this need not prevent a player

from leaving an army in an exposed position and hoping that the belligerency of his foes will lead to its destruction.

A serious inequity now appears in the position adopted by Graustark many years ago and adhered to since. A player with a retreating force, with several available spaces for retreat, can always opt to destroy the force, if he wants to, since he need only neglect to send in a retreat order to have the force removed. The player with only one space available for retreat is denied the same right, since the retreat is made for him automatically.

The first zine to realize the problem and to do something about it was Wild 'n Woolly. In its great days it published at 9 day intervals and all retreat orders had to be explicitly written, even when there was only one space open. This gave the player with only one available retreat the same chance to "forget" to send in a retreat order as other more fortunate players already had. The 9 day publishing schedule was too much for other editors to follow, and even Wild 'n Woolly abandoned it after some time. Since then, zines have tried to use other methods which would allow an equal chance to the player with only one retreat hole, and the one with several. They have tried also to retain the speed permitted by the automatic retreat move.

Graustark has fully automatic retreat in cases where there is only a single space for retreat available. That is, it accepts the difference in treatment accorded the player with only one space available and the one with several. One law for the rich and another, rougher, one for the poor, a surprising stand for a man of John's political beliefs.

Armageddonia and Erehwon do not appear to have stated their position.

Broddingnag makes retreat for a force with only single retreat but player has right of refusing and ordering unit off instead. Future moves by other players should be made with this possibility in mind.

It should, perhaps, be pointed out that the unfairness of treating the player with only one space available differently than the one with several will not often arise in practice. Even in zines which specifically allow the removal option it will only very rarely be exercised.

17. Two forces retreating to the same space. If two forces are dislodged and both retreat to the same vacant space, what happens? The rulebook doesn't say. In Calhmer's opinion, they should be given a second chance to retreat, the space previously chosen being barred to both, and the process repeated until a compatible set of retreats is found. If, in going through the possibilities, one of them runs out of possibilities before the other, that unit comes off. In postal play, where even a single retreat upsets time tables and to some extent disrupts a game, Calhmer's solution has never been popular and most

magazines order the annihilation of both units. Even this allows some differences, however. Suppose both retreating forces belong to the same power, or to two powers closely allied. Both units will be annihilated. But in zines which allow one to retreat or to stand and die where one is, it is possible to order one of the forces to retreat and the other not, thus saving one of them.

Graustark's rule is that two forces retreating to the same space are both annihilated. If only one space is available to both, they are both annihilated.

Armageddonia and Erehwon annihilate two units which retreat to the same space.

Brobdignag annihilates two units retreating to the same space, but a player may, in such a case, order retreat or not, so that there is a possibility of saving one if both belong to one power or to an alliance.

18. Retreats closed by stand-off. The rulebook states that a dislodged unit may not retreat to "a space which was left vacant due to a stand off on the move." Obviously, if a Russian army Warsaw and a German army Berlin, both try for Silesia and stand one another off, and if one of these forces is dislodged by other action then Silesia is barred to it as a place to retreat to. But is it barred to another unit, say an Austrian army Galicia, which is also dislodged? The view has always been that such a space is barred to all retreats during the season of play in question. Latimer has raised the question if that interpretation is correct. So far, no magazine has followed his suggestion that the space is only barred to retreats by the forces standing each other off, and not to other retreating units.

19. Retreat via convoy. From time to time the question is asked if an army, dislodged and forced to retreat, may use an adjacent fleet to convoy it to retreat. No zine known to me has ever allowed such retreat via convoy.

20. The Coastal Crawl. Consider the following set of moves for Italy:

Fleet Portugal to Spain, north coast
Fleet Spain, south coast, to Portugal.

Is it legal? According to the rulebook, a fleet in a province with a divided coastline is regarded, to some extent at least, as occupying the whole province. Moreover, according to the rulebook, two units cannot exchange positions. From this point of view the move seems illegal. On the other hand the move is precisely what real fleets, prevented from using the high seas by superior hostile forces, would do if they wished to move northward. And, in some respects, the move is analogous to Fleet Naples to Rome, Fleet Rome to Tuscany, which is certainly legal.

Graustark, Armageddonia, Erehwon, and Brobdignag all allow

the Coastal Crawl. And I think I am correct in stating that an instance of its use has never occurred in the games of any of them.

21. The Crawling Retreat. Charles Wells has very recently pointed out an odd feature of the Coastal Crawl. Suppose France plays,

Fleet Spain, north coast, to Portugal

Fleet Mid-Atlantic Ocean support fleet Spain (nc) to Portugal,

and suppose that Italy has a fleet in Portugal which is then dislodged by the move. May that fleet then retreat to the south coast of Spain? In those zines which allow the Crawl it would seem to follow logically that the retreat is also allowable.

Graustark and Armageddonia have not commented on the question.

Brobdingnag hereby states that it will allow such a retreat. I think Erehwon has declared in a similar sense but I cannot find the reference.

22. The force simultaneously attacked from two sides. Consider the following moves when Italy has an army in Spain,

France: Army Gascony to Spain

Army Marseilles support army Gascony to Spain

England: Fleet Mid-Atlantic to Spain, sc.

Fleet Portugal support fleet Mid-Atlantic to Spain, sc.

We note that if either of the western powers had made its attack and the other had merely held, that the Italian force would be annihilated. What happens when both make the indicated moves? There was considerable discussion about cases like this in the early days, the feeling being that a force too weak to withstand the assault of a single aggressive neighbour certainly wouldn't be able to hold off attacks from two. The lamentable history of Poland would seem to support this point of view. However, the rulebook is quite plain. A force is dislodged, or annihilated if no retreat is available, only when a hostile force succeeds in occupying the space which it previously held. In this case neither the English nor the French attack succeeds, as they are equally supported and stand each other off. Therefore, the Italian force continues to survive, quite unaffected, although under attack by four times its own strength. This interpretation is followed by Graustark, Armageddonia, Erehwon, Brobdingnag and also by all other zines nowadays.

23. The Spring Raid. The rulebook states, "Occupation of a supply center by a Great Power occurs when one of its units is located in that supply center immediately after a Fall move, complete with retreats, if any, has been played" The accepted interpretation of this is that a country acquires title to a supply center if its forces are in occupation of it on a Fall move, and that it retains that possession, no matter how many foreign units pass through the place, provided that the foreign units only enter in the Spring and leave again the same Fall, that is, as long as their is not a foreign unit

in the centre at the end of a Fall move.

From time to time the suggestion has been made that a unit entering a supply centre in the Spring and leaving the same Fall, while not sufficing to gain possession of the centre for the owner of the unit, ought to remove it from the control of the previous owner. For example, if Serbia belonged to Austria, and if a Russian unit entered in the Spring of a certain year and left the same Fall without an Austrian force entering then to re-acquire possession, then Serbia would become neutral territory, just as it was at the beginning of the game and not count as a supply centre of either Great Power.

The move would then have something of the character of a long range raid in force, not taking over the conquered territory for the benefit of its own country, but creating enough general wastage and destruction so that the territory could no longer contribute to the economic support of the previous owner. This type of operation has certainly been widely used in actual warfare, although it was not an especially marked feature of the Great War on which our game is based. Sherman's March springs to mind as a prominent example. And, in more recent years, the Air Forces of the world are imbued with this destruction without occupation philosophy.

Don Miller is, as far as I know, the only gamesmaster who has ever run the game with such an interpretation. Most of his games do not have this feature, although a few of them did.

In Graustark, Armageddonia, Erehwon, and Broddingnag a territory raided in the Spring and abandoned the same Fall, remains in the possession of its previous owner.

24. Order of removal. Dealing with the removal of units for a country whose commander submits no orders, the rulebook states, "If the country has to remove units because it has lost supply centers, the unit farthest from home comes off first, and the fleet before the army." This is all very well, as far as it goes, but it doesn't go very far. What is this "home" that we are supposed to measure from? Is it the nearest boundary of the empire concerned? Is it the capital? Is it any of its supply centres? Is it the supply centre from which the particular unit that we are considering actually originated? All of the first three have been used in different zines, and the only reason that the fourth hasn't been as well is that it involves a good deal of work on the part of the gamesmaster, as he would have to trace the past history of every unit on the board belonging to the power concerned. And how do you measure distance? In miles or kilometers? We note that there is no scale of miles (or kilometers) on the map although it is provided . . . with a scale of depth of the ocean, a factor of no importance to the game. Moreover to introduce this type of measurement is to use a metric not used at all elsewhere in the game. The other alternative is to count distance in steps. Paris is two seasons' march from Munich, for example. If we opt for this way of measuring distance should we allow convoy in counting steps or not? Whichever choice we make leads to apparent absurdities. If we don't allow convoy

then every English army on the continent is an infinite distance from home and there is no basis of comparison between two of them: an English army in Brest is as far from home as one in Constantinople, and both of them are further from home than an English fleet in the Black Sea. Similarly for armies of the other powers in England, and the armies of any power in Tunis or North Africa.

As will be seen there is a great deal of uncertainty in the application of the rule, so much so that in many, perhaps most, cases resort must eventually be had to spinning a coin or something similar to decide which unit to remove. Before the game was commercially produced all units were numbered; that is, in Calhamer's original game if Germany built an army and a fleet in 1901 they would be numbered third army and second fleet, respectively, taking rank immediately after the units that Germany had when the game began. It was therefore then easy to establish priority of removal on the basis of the numbers and that was, I believe, the way the matter was then handled.

How serious this can be may be shown by an example. It is a game with a no-replacement policy. The player for Germany is known to have left the game. It is the Fall move and Germany has a supply centre, say Sweden, which is open and undefended and there is a foreign force bearing on it. Every player in the game expects Sweden to change hands. Suppose Germany has armies still existing in Burgundy and Tyrolia, and that these are the only forces it has outside its own frontiers. Which is to come off? Under almost all definitions of "home" the two are equally far, and the choice between them will be made by a chance device. Is this fair to the players for France, and Austria, say, who must themselves, now, move units so as to gain the most possible advantage in the Spring after the removal has been made? The reader may feel that it is much the same as in the case when there is a player for Germany who will himself decide what to remove, the other players again having to guess what he will actually remove. But there is, it seems to me, a real difference in the two cases. If there is a player for Germany there he will make the removal which will do him the least harm. The other players have a basis on which to base their own moves. They may guess wrong, of course, but they do have some grounds on which to base their guess. They have no grounds at all when the decision is made by the future toss of a coin now lying in the gamesmaster's pocket.

(I might mention that about a year and a half ago in the course of a letter dealing with various rule questions, Calhamer asked me if I didn't think that this removal paragraph should be made more definite. In my reply I rather scoffed at this, and said that the main thing was to allow the active player to make his own choice of removal, and that it didn't much matter what was done about the player who neglects to send in his retreats. Looking back on it now I see that Mr. Calhamer and I were thinking about very different things. I was thinking about the postal game, where the casual missed move is frequent; my main thought was that the player who doesn't miss moves, get some reward in the form of additional choice, denied

to the player who has neglected to send in his move. But this is not what Calhamer was thinking of, nor is it what the rulebook paragraph is designed to deal with. He, and it, are thinking of the case of a player who has definitely left the game. Such a player is immune to hope of reward or fear of punishment alike, and has no further rights at all. It was rather the rights of the other players, the ones who remain, which Calhamer thought would be improved by going back to a more definitely established order of removal. Of course, we can continue to apply the rulebook paragraph to the case of the casual miss, as well; but we shouldn't forget that the casual missed move is not really what it is designed to deal with.)

Graustark counts distance in move steps. I don't know what it does about including convoy moves in counting steps. In practice, although I don't think explicitly stated, it removes a unit not in a supply centre, ahead of one that is, other things equal.

Armageddonia removes the unit which, in the Gamesmaster's judgment, does least damage to the position of the power concerned.

Erehwon removes using the following schedule of priorities,

1. Farthest from home,
2. Non-supply centre before supply centre,
3. Fleet before army,
4. North before south,
5. East before west.

Brobdingnag hereby adopts the following rule for its own games:

Home consists of the nearest home supply centre.

Distance is counted in steps, not metric distance.

Convoy moves are used in counting steps only if the unit cannot otherwise reach home. In such cases only single convoy steps, not convoy chains will be used. (This is last is to prevent absurdities such as London being closer to Turkey than is Serbia, which was a part of the Turkish empire for some centuries.)

If the distance and fleet-army rules leave a tie, the unit will come off first whose location stands the higher in alphabetical order. (For instance, in the example in the main section, army Burgundy would come off before army Tyrolia. It will be realized that this has the same purpose as rules 4 and 5 in the Erehwon set. I like it better though. In Erehwon's rule if it is a central power which drops, its eastern neighbours will always gain the advantage in comparison with the western ones. Since the space names were assigned on quite different considerations, they are random with respect to any directional bias. In the example quoted, with Burgundy removed, France not Austria got the better break. But next time, when it is ~~between~~ between Prussia and Ruhr, the advantage will fall the other way.)

I would be glad of comments on this section from any reader.

25. The you-only-live-once game. There are two ways in which an army, or fleet, may be removed from play in Diplomacy. First, the player may lose a supply centre. As he then hasn't the "wealth" required to support his military establishment, he must remove a unit at the conclusion of the next Fall move. This more resembles disbandment than annihilation. If one likes to picture it that way one can consider this unit as turning its weapons and equipment into stores for possible re-issue.

The other annihilation is very different in origin and in mental picture, although the consequences are much the same. This is when a unit is surrounded in the field, dislodged in a situation where there is no possible retreat, and so destroyed.

The Scarborough Diplomacy club, back in the early days, played a game in which a unit lost in the second manner, that is, broken up in the field, could not be replaced, and the player concerned had to remain a unit short for the remainder of the game. Dick Schultz, too, back in 1964, thought that this was the rule of the game. (Derek Nelson and Dick Schultz know each other so it is possible that one got the idea from the other. It is noteworthy, though, that Derek felt certain that he had seen such a rule in print, and was surprised not to find it in the rulebook when he looked. Also, according to Koning, Schultz was quite vehement in his letter to John Smythe dealing with this. This makes me wonder if such a rule may not have been included in an earlier, pre-commercial version of the game and later dropped.)

The rulebook statement concerning building of units certainly contradicts this version of the game. It would, I feel, produce a more cautious and conservative game, and, under such a ruling, players would be less inclined to "throw away armies as if they were chips of wood", as John Koning is always saying. It would also do away with any desire to annihilate rather than order the retreat of a force, as there could be no re-building at home thereafter.

No magazine uses this version of the game.

26. The Gilliland Incident situation. In Euritania #21, published on the 16th of August 1964, Allan Calhamer, the game's inventor, playing Germany, made the following set of moves,

Army Munich to Bohemia
Army Kiel to Munich
Army Ruhr support army Kiel to Munich.

With his moves he sent the following note, "Perhaps it is not necessary, but let me mention that if my piece fails to get out of Munich, it is not dislodged by my attempted move in with support. This is covered at the end of the section "The Support Order".

The Gamesmaster of the game, in his published reply to the

note, stated, "We are aware of this, and in fact dispatched a note to Dick Schultz immediately upon receipt of a recent issue of BROB where he ruled otherwise."

The passages of the rulebook to which Mr. Calhamer referred in his note are the following:

"Equally well supported units which conflict in the situations described under "Conflicts" above, follow those rules." ((The "Conflicts" paragraph gives the usual rules for stand-off.))

"...an order to move, with support, against a unit belonging to the same country as the moving or supporting unit is of no effect; that is, a country may not force one of its own units to retreat."

This combination of moves is often made. A country tries to move a unit out of the space it is in. It tries to follow in with another unit. This second unit is supported one or more times. The effects then are, if the unit in the van succeeds in its attempt to move, that the following unit follows it if it is opposed by a single enemy force, or, at the least, that it stands the enemy off and leaves the space vacant, if it is opposed by an equally supported force.

Moreover, if the unit in the space does not succeed in getting out, the supported follow up, would stand-off any equally supported hostile force, and so, in effect, give support, standing, to the unit in the forefront of the battle. Mr. Calhamer's statement shows that he intended that effect.

Dave McDaniel/Steve Johnstone, the gamesmaster of the Ruritania game accepted Calhamer's position. His remarks indicate that he held it before receiving Mr. Calhamer's note. As he was at the time a member of the group who played Diplomacy at LASFS the supposition is that that club also played the game in that fashion. Moreover, in the following issue of Ruritania there was a letter from Jim Goldman, objecting to a force attacked from two sides ruling of Ruritania's (see section 22, above) but supporting Calhamer's position and stating that that was the interpretation used in the East Paterson, New Jersey Diplomacy Club. In other words, the two most active Diplomacy clubs of the time were already playing the game in accordance with Calhamer's interpretation of the relevant rules as far as this move combination was concerned. Boardman had bound himself to be ruled by Calhamer's interpretations on all issues. John Smythe and Dick Schultz, the only two other gamesmasters then publishing raised no objections, and we find a remarkable agreement in all quarters of the Diplomacy world.

Then, in Barad-Dur #27, published 15th of August 1966, almost exactly two years after the printing of Calhamer's statement the following set of moves appeared:

England: Fleet Denmark to Kiel
Fleet North Sea to Denmark
Fleet Helgoland Bight support fleet North Sea to Denmark

Russia: Fleet Skagerrak to Denmark
Fleet Baltic support fleet Skag to Denmark

The English fleet Denmark did not make it out of that province. The Gamesmaster, Jack Chalker, ruled that the Russian forces succeeded in their attack on Denmark and the English fleet was annihilated, having no available retreat. This was at complete variance with what had been during the previous two years the generally accepted game. Alexis Gilliland, the player for England, resigned in protest. For a month or two there was a heated discussion in various parts of the Diplomatic press; Jack Chalker put the matter to a referendum among his players, who refused to support his stand; Chalker then reversed his ruling but as several moves had intervened, and as Gilliland had already resigned, this did the latter little good.

I believe that every magazine now publishing would rule that the fleet in Denmark would stand, and that the English and Russian attacks on it would stand each other off. I believe that any gamesmaster who knew anything of the rules and of the history of rules discussion, would have so ruled at any time after the publication of Calhmer's statement in 1964. Or that, if not, he would declare in advance that he was running the game under such and such deviations from the accepted standard.

27. The self standoff. Turkey has a unit in Bulgaria and another in Smyrna but has no other units in the vicinity. There is a hostile fleet in the Aegean, which may be expected to make a strike at one or other of Bulgaria, Constantinople, or Smyrna. With only two forces to defend three centres there is one chance in three that Turkey will guess wrong and leave undefended the space which the fleet tries for; the consequent loss of a supply centre might be disastrous. A commonly used defensive manoeuvre is for Turkey to play both the Bulgarian force and the one in Smyrna to Constantinople. The units stand each other off and, at the same time, stand off any unsupported enemy move to Constantinople. As they then remain in Bulgaria and Smyrna, they likewise prevent any capture of those centres. Two forces can thus defend three spaces. Some players of the so-called "realist" school have objected to the move as it corresponds with nothing which occurs on real war. However, most magazines permit it and it is used fairly often when a player wants, for whatever reason, to prevent another player from entering a certain space but does not want to enter it himself.

Graustark, Armageddonia, Erewhon, and Brobdingnag all permit the move.

28. The self standoff countered by hostile support. Quite recently Hank Reinhardt, playing in Lonely Mountain has developed a counter which is sometimes effective against the self-standoff move.

In the example given in the last section the attacking player, let's call him Italy, might guess that Turkey would use the self standoff move. Instead of attacking any of the three centres he might then play Fleet Aegean support TURKISH army Bulgaria to Constantinople, thus ensuring that that move would succeed. This would, of course, not give him any of the supply centres but it might help him in one of two ways:

1. Italy may be bringing up other forces for an attack on Bulgaria. Moving the defending force out of that centre may help him on the next season's play.
2. The Italian player may not really covet any of the three centres but he may want to ensure that Turkey does not have Constantinople open for a build. His move closes it.

It has sometimes been suggested that support of a foreign unit should only be effective if the player being supported states that he wants the support. Such an interpretation would, of course, upset the counter-move. I think that there are serious objections to introducing such a prohibition:

1. With the lack of communication between players, and even between allies, and the general sloppiness in writing orders which is prevalent, there would be many cases of welcomed support stultified through failure of a player to inform his gamesmaster that he expects such and such allied units to support.
2. The rulebook explicitly allows support without consent of the supported player, in the case of units left standing by a player who leaves the game. There is another argument for allowing the move. As the "realists" used to point out the self standoff move itself has no close analogy with anything done in actual war, it is a case of taking advantage of the wording of the rulebook to achieve a wanted result. If the defender is allowed to use the letter of the law in this way, the attacker should have the same privilege, and there is certainly nothing in the present rulebook to specifically prevent the move.

In Brobdingnag the move is legal. I believe that editors of Graustark, Armageddonia, and Erehwon have not declared themselves. Accordingly the Brob procedure will be used in their games as well, unless objection is received from them.

29. Exchange of units (The Changing of the Guard). The rulebook states, "Two units may not exchange positions on any move." The intent of this is plain. If France orders an army from Burgundy to Munich and Germany simultaneously orders an army Munich to Burgundy they would not, in the real world, pass through each other without collision. And the rulebook statement ensures that a front will develop between the countries, each army pushing against its enemy across it.

The difficulty arises in the case of two units, one an army and one a fleet, owned by the same power. Suppose Germany has a

fleet in Belgium and an army in Holland. Suppose it wants to use the unit in Belgium to strike inland at Burgundy in conjunction with other units now in Munich, in the Ruhr, or both. The fleet in Belgium cannot strike southward and the player would like, in preparation for the following move, to interchange the army and fleet. In the standard game, however, the rulebook statement about interchange prevents this, quite as much as a change of position of two hostile forces.

In an effort to get around this difficulty it has sometimes been suggested that the interchange be done by convoy. In the example quoted, suppose that Germany has a fleet in the North Sea. Then the suggestion is that the set of moves

Army Holland to Belgium via convoy
Fleet North Sea convoy army Holland to Belgium
Fleet Belgium to Holland

could succeed. The reason for thinking that this should succeed, while the more direct order without the convoy would not, is that the units concerned no longer have to pass through a common boundary in opposite directions. The fleet, going from Belgium to Holland, does pass through their common boundary, but the army, on the contrary, goes first from Holland to the North Sea and then south to Belgium, without crossing the Holland-Belgium frontier at all. Is the move legal under the rulebook?

The discussion above deals with two distinct, though related rule questions. Let us separate them for the rulings.

29. The Changing of the Guard, that is to say the direct interchange of a fleet and an army belonging to the same power, without invoking a convoy.

Graustark hasn't ruled but I would expect would not, based on Boardman's general philosophy of the game.

Armageddonia does not permit.

Erehwon, where the name for the dispute originated, does permit.

BROBDINGNAG does not permit.

30. Exchange by convoy.

Graustark does permit. It uses an extension of Brannan's Rule as basis for the decision. It should be noted that Brannan's Rule appeared as one of the Wild 'n Woolly house rules. Those rules have always included a specific prohibition of units exchanging position by convoy.

Armageddonia does not permit.

Erehwon does permit.

Brobdingnag does not permit the exchange by convoy, the rulebook prohibition being regarded as applying to this case as well as to the more direct move.

(Although there is no dispute about it, or disagreement as to rule interpretation, this is probably the place to discuss the Merry-Go-Round move. If, in the example of Germany given above, that country makes the following set of moves,

Army Holland to Belgium
Fleet Belgium to North Sea
Fleet North Sea to Holland,

and if all moves succeed, it will have effectively accomplished the desired exchange without any two pieces have actually exchanged positions. The first time I saw a move of this type was when Derek Nelson used it in a three handed game with Ken Davidson and myself, and it startled me. Against an alert and aggressive opponent, however, it is unlikely to succeed as a single strike against any one of the units concerned will jam the whole roundabout, the initial stand-off backing up around the ring. Rings of more than three elements may be used but the chance of jamming increases with the number of pieces.)

31. The convoy-through-coastal-province game. Many A-H wargamers have become accustomed to a game in which an army may be convoyed by a fleet which is in a coastal province. For example,

Army Picardy to Holland
Fleet Belgium convoy army Picardy to Holland

would be legal. This version of the game appears to have been used very extensively in general wargaming circles. I have had letters from such asking about it; I have even had letters asking about other points where, from the wording, it was evident that this interpretation was being taken for granted. Only once was it suggested in the 'zines, namely by Norman McLeod when he began his Xanadu and he disallowed the move in the next issue. (Norman, by the way, was an A-H wargamer before he entered postal Diplomacy.)

There is no doubt that this game is contrary to the rulebook. The latter, at the top of page two, makes a dichotomy between "provinces", and "bodies of water". In the following paragraph it indicates that fleets may enter either "bodies of water" or coastal provinces. However, page 5, it is clearly stated that convoy may be ~~made~~ through bodies of water. There is no statement that convoy can be used where ever fleets may go. There seems no reason, either in law, or in "reality", for introducing this interpretation, and it has never been used in any magazine, with the partial exception mentioned above, of Xanadu.

32. The "Kolin" game. A correspondent once wrote to tell me that the "way he had always played the game" was to have any force, attacked by a hostile force, "turn and face its attacker", rather than carry out its orders. This would include, of course, the rule book case of cutting of support. It would also include von Metzke's Cutting of the cutting of support, see section 8, above. That would not be all, however. Consider a German player who wishes to broaden his front against the Russians. Suppose he plays,

Army Silesia to Bohemia
Army Prussia to Silesia
Army Berlin to Prussia
Army Munich support army Silesia to Bohemia,

he would end up with a front three units wide, rather than two, which might often be an advantage. Whether or not it would succeed would depend on the disposition of the Russian forces and their action. Since the German player is supporting the move to Bohemia, he apparently fears a Russian attack upon that province, say from Galicia. Suppose, instead of attacking Bohemia, the Russian army Galicia makes a strike at Silesia. Under the current game the move to Bohemia succeed. Silesia is stood off but, on the next move, Germany can use all of Berlin, Prussia Bohemia, and Munich to support a move into Silesia and the front would be established three wide. Under the proposed game, an attack from Galicia on Silesia would halt the Silesian army on its way to Bohemia, since it must stand and face its attacker, and the whole series of moves would be stood off by the single attack.

I should perhaps say, that I don't really understand the game. My correspondent's letter was very brief. I wrote asking him for more details but got no reply. If it is as I have sketched it above, the tactics would be quite different from our current game. It is difficult to say, without having played it, but my guess would be that the proposed game would be even more likely to result in jammed stalemated positions than the standard game is.

(The battle of Kolin seems an appropriate name to apply to this game. In that battle Frederick the Great attempted his favorite manoeuvre, his famed oblique order. In it, one flank of an army is deliberately weakened to provide troops to extend and strengthen the other flank. In the battle of Kolin some of Frederick's troops, marching to the flank, came under fire from the hostile (Austrian) skirmishers. Contrary to Frederick's plan they promptly wheeled into line to face their attackers. The Prussians then found themselves with all of the following factors against them:

1. The flank providing the reserves was, of course, weakened. This was the normal price that had to be paid for use of the oblique order.
2. The other flank which was to have received re-inforcement did not receive it, as these troops had already engaged in the centre of the field.

3. The troops in the centre could not fire, as what was now in front of them was the body of their own comrades who should have been marching to extend the flank.

Kolin turned out to be one of the worst disasters suffered by the Prussians during Frederick's reign.

Dann schrieb hinein die Zitterhand:
"Kolin. Mein Sohn versharret im Sand.
Wer weiss wo.")

As can be seen, the effect of introducing the proposed rule into our game would be much the same as what actually happened at Kolin, anytime a player attempted to move a force across the front of an enemy position.

33. Et ceterae dissensiones.

As can be seen the list of rule disagreements is quite lengthy. What may not be so apparent to the newer player is that, in spite of all, we all play very much the same game. Two of these questions do turn up with fair frequency in actual games, namely, Koning's Rule and Boardman's Dilemma. Every player should know how his gamesmaster rules on these two questions. In a game which goes to a position of one strong player against the rest of the board, the victory criterion rule being used will be important for a move or so. All of the others are very rare events indeed.

- - - - -

Rather closely associated with rule interpretation is the player replacement policy of the various zines. Those that we are here concerned with have the replacement rules indicated below:

Graustark has for each of its games two named stand-by players. If a player misses a move the first stand by is asked to send in the following move for the country. If the initial player himself sends in the following move he retains control of his country. If not, the stand-by's move is accepted, and the country is re-assigned to him. If stand-by moves are required for more than two positions, volunteers are called for for the third and later misses.

Erehwon's rule is very similar to Grau's except that it normally has five named stand-by players per game.

Armageddonia uses a neutral stand-by at the gamesmaster's discretion. Recently, the gamesmaster's discretion has seemed to lean to no neutral standby as there have been a lot of moves marked MR. Since Ken Davidson left Ralston for Denmark in the spring of 1967 there have been no Diplomacy players here, except myself, so that

neutral stand-by players can not be appointed here.

Brobdingnag regards the initial player for a country to be playing until such time as he resigns. If he resigns he is asked to appoint his own replacement. Under some circumstances the gamesmaster will make the replacement for him, if asked to do so.

- - - - -

Brobdingnag Playing Procedures.

Those playing in games which I will be running for a move or two this summer should note the following:

1. Mail to and from Ralston is slow. While all first class mail in Canada goes by air, if there is a saving in time, and this has been the case for many years, and while a similar service is now given in the United States, this does NOT apply to cross-border mail, in either direction. Players should, therefore, use Air Mail stamps, and mark their letters "Air Mail". Even with this precaution more time should be allowed than you are used to in writing New York or Rantoul.
2. Deadline is 12, noon, Mountain Standard Time, of the date indicated. That is the same as noon Pacific Daylight on the west coast, and 3 P.M., Eastern Daylight in the east.
3. For auxilliary moves, that is, Builds, removals, and special retreat moves, the gamesmaster reserves the right to publish ahead of deadline, as soon as moves are received from all concerned. Revisions received after such publication will not be considered. (On normal Spring and Fall moves, of course, revisions will be received up to the deadline hour.)
4. The gamesmaster reserves the right to publish any move by carbon-copy letter, rather than by an issue of the magazine, if it appears to him that such action will speed the progress of the game. Such moves will later be re-published in the zine. Letter publication will not normally contain any but the briefest and most urgent Press Releases
5. Players are responsible for checking the accuracy of published moves. If an error in transcription, or ruling, is caught before the publication of the following move, it can always be corrected. Once a later move has been published, however, it must stand.
6. Future moves, conditional on the outcome of the current move, are accepted and are welcomed.
7. My phone number is Ralston, 201. The local is 263 or 279 during normal business hours, 240 at other times. It is best to place phone

calls through the operator at Medicine Hat, Alberta, area code 403.

8. For telegrams the address is care of DRES, Suffield, Alberta. My experience of moves received by wire is that they are usually garbled to some extent. So do not abbreviate unduly.

9. The main article, this issue, discusses rule interpretation in some detail. These games will be conducted in conformity with the rule interpretation of their respective parent magazines, as far as I understand them. Broddingnag interpretations will only be used when the gamesmaster of the parent zine has not declared his position on the item in question.

10. If a player expects to be away from his usual address for an appreciable length of time, please inform me, so that alternate delivery of your copy of the zine can be arranged.

11. I would be glad to be informed of the phone numbers of players although I don't expect to use them.

12. If there is a feature of the playing procedure which you do not understand, write and ask. Similarly if, due to some emergency, you feel you must have an extension of a deadline, write and ask. A postcard with two lines on it, sent in time, will accomplish far more than paragraphs of complaint after the event.

- - - - -

SEALED BAG

John R. Root, President, Games Research, Inc., 48 Wareham St., Boston, Mass.

Concerning the rules of Diplomacy, there are minor changes between the first and second editions. There has not been any third edition, although we do believe there should be. If you or your readers have any suggestions as to how the rules might be improved, we would welcome them.

((+(As a glance through the first 24 pages of this issue will show there is ample scope for clarification of the present rulebook. As long ago as the 3rd of January 1936, in issue #30 of this publication I urged Mr. Calhamer to completely revise the rulebook in order to eliminate the ambiguities and omissions which occur in it. The passage of time has lengthened the list of known ambiguities but has not otherwise altered the situation. What would you do if some morning you found that I had sent you the manuscript of a completely revised rulebook? What would Mr. Calhamer do on receiving his carbon copy of it? - jamcc)+))

- - - - -

Diplomacy is a game, manufactured and sold by Games Research whose address appears above. Broddingnag is a journal devoted to that game. It is edited and published by John McCallum, Edmonton, Alberta. Price 10 cents.